A Study on the Frequency of Occurrence and Usage of Anglicism in Speech of Young Iranian Telegram Users

Davood Mashhadi Heidar[1]
Mohammadreza Mollahosseiny [*] [2]
Masoumeh Asaee[1]

Abstract

This paper investigates the frequency of occurrence of English borrowed words in terms of three variables of age, gender, and educational status. To do so, a corpus including the extant files of participants in a target group of telegram social networking was selected and analyzed. The quantitative study of the data shows that the occurrence of the loanwords is much more frequent in the speech of both youngster and highly educated telegram users. The results indicated that Persian speakers' tendency to employ more Anglicism in particular functional domains can be justified in terms of gender differentiation. In short, the results of this study highlights that Telegram social networking inter alia expedites the ongoing process of loan word influx into Persian language.

Keywords: Loanwords, Lexical borrowing, Anglicism, Social networking.

---

1 .Department of TEFL, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran,

2 .[*]Department of TEFL, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran reza.mollahosseiny@gmail.com (Corresponding author)

1. Introduction

Different world languages have, in the course of history, come into varying degrees of contact with each other and have had different influences on one another (Hojati, Roustaei & Mirzaee, 2013).

Language contact and the influence of one language on another are very common phenomena (Ahmed Islam, 2011). Persian like many other world languages, is far from a pure language. In fact, it has borrowed a great bulk of items, including words and grammatical structures, from many different languages, including English, Arabic, French, Turkish, Greek, and Russian. In fact, Persian (Farsi) has incorporated so many linguistic items from other languages that we can call it a mixed language.

The main purpose of this study was to explore the new lexical items in the present Persian language borrowed from English, ways of their distribution and domain of use in the accepted language.

The motive for selecting this topic was due to insufficient research of lexical borrowings from English language from the standpoint of their number, content, extent and idiosyncrasies of their adaptation or integration into Persian language. These phenomena can be connected with the processes of globalization fixed at lexical level of many languages being under the influence of Anglo-American culture, and, in particular, with growth of penetration of English-American words into Persian lexical system via social networking and mass media.

2. Background of the study

Many sociolinguistic studies have dealt with word borrowing in correlation with cross linguistic issues, and Social factors (e.g. Tsvetkov & Dyer, 2016; Xia & Miller, 2013; Hoffer,2005; Ljosland, 2011) such as sex, age, occupation and social class. All of these studies show the degree of influence that each social factor has on the occurrence of loanwords in the speech of speakers in recipient language.

The influence of gender on learners' performance regarding some phonological aspects of loanwords has been emphasized by Preston & Yamagata (2004). Hojati (2012) examined Iranian EFL learners' pronunciation errors regarding high-frequency technology-related English loanwords and highlighted the need for the devotion of more pedagogical and research attention to the problems confronting Farsi-speakers in the area of the pronunciation of loan words.

Despite a great body of research conducted on word borrowing, only few studies have attempted to propose a comprehensive classification of loanword categories regarding functional domain of usage.

Winter-Froemel (2008) remarks on the lack of studies that deal with a description and classification of loanwords categories. And this gap is more obvious in Iranian EFL context regarding the prevalence of Anglicism in Persian language.

3. Significance of the study

Although influential work has been done on different general theoretical aspects of English loanwords in Persian language, only a few demanding studies have attempted to shed light upon the modern technological channels in which Anglicism is adopted into the Persian language system.

Even though previous works have examined the absorption of English loanwords into the Persian system, none of them deals with the relationship between gender, age, and educational status and the use of Anglicism in the language of social networking with a specific focus on telegram as prevalent software by which many cell-phones are programmed.

The Persian language is said to have borrowed more than fifty percent of its vocabulary. The great majority of these loanwords are of Arabic origin. What is more, many of the Arabic loanwords have already become so established in Farsi that they are no longer supposed as borrowed words. Apart from borrowings from Arabic, there are also early Turkish and Greek borrowings.

Moreover, Persian has also been influenced by European languages such as French, Russian, and finally, English. Marszałek-Kowalewska (2013). As the focal theme of this paper, we are primarily concerned with the prevalent use of Anglicism in Persian language, and the reasons of such a phenomenon with a particular focus on the application of social networking including telegram. First, it would be helpful to elaborate on the concept of social networking phenomenon and then define the term borrowing.

4. Social Networking

Social networking sites create communities based on users' shared interests and beliefs (Kuswara, Cram &Richards, 2008). Moreover, these types of sites raise opportunity for personal learning of users. According to Baatarjav, Phithakkitnukoon, & Dantu (2008), social networking sites bring together the users with joint interests, communal trust, and seeking access to similar resources.

Being friendly with users, engaging them collaboratively in manifold groups, and providing supple communication are their attributes. Rambe (2012) held that these

sites are ideal spaces for mediated intellectual engagement because of the kind of membership and informal knowledge sharing that they trigger.

According to Armstrong (2005, p.143), borrowing is "one of the ways in which a language enriches its lexicon." This method is rests on the transference of a word from one language into another at different levels with varying degrees, 'phonological', 'morphological', 'lexical', 'semantic', 'orthographic', and 'phraseological'.

Linguists refer to processes whereby languages receive foreign words as 'lexical borrowing'. Foreign words which are borrowed by and incorporated into a language are called loanwords (Fromkin, Rodman & Hymas (2010). Loanwords, as Litchfield West (1997) has noted, are absorbed by other languages chiefly through contacts with speakers of recipient languages.

Loanwords are words of one language, labeled as the source language that enter in a borrowing or inheritor language. The adaptation of a loanword entails the tenacity of often conflicting demands to preserve as much information from the source word as possible while still satisfying the limits that make the lexical item sound like a word of the recipient language (Kenstowicz & Atiwong, 2004, p.1). In other words, in the process of entering the borrowing language, the phonetic, phonemic, phonotactic or prosodic features of these words change in the vast majority of cases (Haunz, 2007, p.3). The influence of foreign loanwords in the Persian language can be historically traced back to the seventh century, but the massive arrival of loanwords is acknowledged over the past 50 years (Marszałek-Kowalewska, 2011).

Apart from historical influences on Farsi, it has also been influenced by recent changes in technology, particularly the advent and increasing use of mobile phones, computers, social networking sites and the Internet (Hojati, et al., 2013; Fromkin, Rodman & Hymas, 2010).

This is particularly true in the case of social mass media. The mushrooming emergence of social media under various titles has hastened the process of Anglicism in Persian language in accordance with other languages.

Therefore, the impact of English on Persian via social networks language is undeniable. As a result, Farsi has inescapably come into contact with many languages, especially English, and has borrowed many lexical items from them (Hojati, et al., 2013).

5. The Theoretical Foundation of the Study

A review of problematic issues in traditional loanword studies reveals that linguistic borrowing is a very common and intensively studied phenomenon (Hall & Hamann,

2003, Peperkamp & Dupoux, 2003, LaCharité & Paradis, 2005). However, various theoretical issues are still not well understood.

How can we adequately describe and classify phenomena of borrowing and loanword? Another key issue in traditional loanword research is the question whether several subgroups of loanwords should be distinguished and if so, how these groups can be defined.

Therefore via adopting the theoretical framework of (Grosjean, 2010) and grounded on ideas and views of such scientists as Winford (2003), Sebastian (2009) and Aitbayev (2007), this study proposes a framework for classification of loanwords based on functional domain of usage in Persian language in order to bridge the research gap regarding the classification of subgroups of Anglicism and the frequency of their usage in Persian language.

The theoretical framework of the study includes work of (Grosjean, 2010) on theory of loanwords whereby borrowed words are treated in three different categories, considering words as completely integrated in the target language, partly integrated, and directly borrowed with no sign of integration in the target language.

Regarding the hypothesis of present paper, the researchers merely focused on the lexical processing namely processing at word level which is defined as looking at the whole string of letters as one. Accordingly, the authors excluded other sub-lexical processing at different levels of the word including orthographical, phonological, and morphological levels.

The present study is a corpus-based description of the collected data aimed at classifying and counting English loanwords found in order to explain the relationship between various variables of age, gender, and educational status with the use of Anglicism. Moreover, the method of content analysis was employed to define the main domains of functioning of Anglicism and their semantic assimilation in the Persian language.

The present study was an attempt to answer the following research questions:

6. Research Questions

1. Is there any difference between various age levels (young, teenager, and adult) of Telegram users regarding the frequency of use of Anglicism in their speech?

2. Is there any difference between the gender (male or female) of telegram users regarding the frequency of use of Anglicism in their speech?

3. Is there any difference between various educational levels (low, moderate, highly educated) Telegram users regarding the frequency of use of Anglicism in their speech?

English borrowings in Persian can be said to be the most contemporary borrowings in that language.

English borrowings in Farsi seem to fall into specific semantic domains. Since the Independence of Islamic republic and up to date, the basic language for borrowing the words in Persian is English.

English words have been steadily adapted in terminology in all domains of social life of Iran: from diplomatic relations to everyday oral communication.

Percentage proportion of vernacular and international words in Persian has not been studied yet. Firstly, due to the fact that borrowing is an extensive process; furthermore, the etymological dictionaries are not sufficiently available.

The scholars still dispute the conversion of international terminologies into Persian language.

In this regard, it is strongly recommended: The plain priority for borrowing the terms is not to use foreign words if the native language has already had familiar and interested term with similar meaning.

It is appropriate to fill the terminological lexical gaps with available international words. In case of unequal level of motivation of the identical terms, the preference shall be given to the most motivated terms (Hudaybergenova ,2003, p. 28).

The current tendency when it comes to lexical borrowings in Farsi is auspicious to the English language.

Although English borrowings do not constitute the mainstream of Farsi loanwords, more and more of them are inflowing language today (Marszałek-Kowalewska, 2009, p.40).

We have conducted the content analysis to the corpus of Persian language mass media and lexicographical literature which revealed that Anglicism is often used in such spheres as: education, economics, policy, food, medicine, all and sundry of professions, information technologies, sports, mass-media etc.

Table.1. Anglicism in Persian language

No	Functioning Domain	Anglicism
1	Education	Syllabus, test, final, quiz, standard, Pass, refuse, type, chart, file, formula, term, accept, academic, professor, type etc.
2	Information technology	computer, modem, mouth, chat, scanner, printer, monitor, site, Skype, blog, Facebook, telegram, start, restart, application, write, antivirus, update, hidden, speaker, flash, charger, link, pad etc. TELEGRAM LOAN WORDS: private, secret chat, setting, sticker, share, profile, screen shot, last seen, edit, forward, new channel, invite friends, block, reject, update, upload , add, clear history, voice, remove, delete, save to gallery, report , GIF, left, send, PM, join, PV, admin, password, unblock, connect, link etc.
3	Sport	box, football, volleyball, handball, basketball, tennis, record, hand, out, goal, penalty, offside, goal, shoot, baseball, forward, back, halfback, service, time out, fair play, knock out/ down etc.
4	Mass media	Journal, bulletin, conference, radio, sponsor, opposition, radical, fraction, parliament, prestige, department, strategy, congress, committee, boycott, occasion, interne, campaign etc.
5	Food	salad, sandwich, pie, cocktail, hamburger, fast food, jelly, biscuit, pizza, restaurant, menu, Garson, macaroni, pasta, lasagna, dessert, cake, sausage, omelet, cutlet, chips, tuna, conserve etc.
6	Medial field	Bandage,Serum,normal,abnormal,nurse,overdose, ampule, dose, capsule, gas sterile, emergency, brancard, intern, recovery, ambulance, metron etc.
7	Professions	ARCHITECTURE, balcony, plan, foundation, salon, hall, penthouse, view, open etc. Tailoring: prove, size, schedule, pans, epol, rolet etc. MECHANIC: lock, airbag, hydraulic, oil pomp, auto service, diagnosis, balance, carwash, high roof, guard, puncture, guardrail, tubeless tire, dashboard etc. TRANSPORTATION: autobus, minibus, train, automobile, motorcycle, metro, van, vanet, taxi etc. BUSINESS: percent, guarantee, vitrine, scant, finance, large, traveller's check, overt, broucher , catalog, supermarket, barcode, patent, model, mark, brand… CINEMA: cut, action, location, genre, scenario, tragedy, theater, artist, melodrama, film, show, video, negative, close up, scene mobile, theme etc.
8	Household. E	telephone, television, hood, freezer, heater, Tablue, package, cutter, sink, mixer, antenna, toaster, cooler, remote controller, lamp, looster etc.
9	Clothing	overcoat, jacket, sweatshirt, sandal, boot, jeans, boot, ray ban, T-shirt, uniform, headband, top, blouse, mantua, pull over etc.

7. Methodology
7.1. Participants

The sample whose comments and posts formed the basis of the collected corpus consisted of telegram users selected via convenient sampling. They were members of a telegram group bearing specific features in terms of age(young, teenager, and adult), gender (male & female), and educational status (low, moderate, and highly educated)

Telegram users. The total number of participants in this study was 120. The demographic information of the participants is presented in the following table.

Table.2. Demographic information of participants

Variables	Gender		Educational status			Age		
	Female	Male	Low	Middle	High	Teen	young	adult
Participants	62	58	38	43	39	36	43	41
Total	120		120			120		

7.2. Instrumentation

The present study employed the whole corpus of a target telegram group as the main source of data collection. The corpus included total files, voices, videos, and private chats of group members. The target group consisting of various age levels, educational levels, and gender was nominated as the source of data collection. The selection of such a group encompassing various levels concerning the variables of the study would present robust evidence on the use of Anglicism words in Persian language.

7.3. Procedure of Data Collection and Data Analysis

In order to collect the samples of Anglicism words in Persian the total extant posts and comments of the target telegram group within a three-month-time span were read meticulously and instances of each type of loanwords were jotted down. The types of materials in the above-mentioned corpus encompassed all of the existing files, voices, photos, shared links, videos and private chats existing in the comments and posts of targeted group members. To ensure that all the instances of the Anglicism words have been covered, the researchers reexamined the whole corpus. After collecting the data, the frequency of each Anglicism word was used to discuss the incorporation of each word within a particular sphere in Persian.

8. Results

As already mentioned, this research aims to investigate the frequency of occurrence of the Anglicism words in Persian via social networking software of telegram. To achieve the objective of this study, the researchers extracted the main Anglicism words and considered the frequency of their usage in the posts and comments of group members. The number of Anglicism in the samples of the fore mentioned corpus was counted. The following tables show the frequency of loanwords employed by group members in terms of various domains of usage.

As table 3 indicates, the frequency of loanwords in various fields of usage is as follows: education: 4 2; sport: 19; professions: 26; food: 29; medicine: 13; clothing: 24; I-tech: 112; mass media: 25 and house hold. E: 30 which were extracted from among the 16910 words observed and analyzed in the corpus of the study. In sum, there were 284 loan words in the targeted corpus.

Statistically speaking, the percentage of the loanwords in terms of gender and in different fields of usage equals to education: (M: 0.08%; F:0.16%); (Sport: M:0. 07%;F:0.03%);(Professions   :M:0.08%;F:0.06%)(food:M: 0.05%;   F:0.11%); (Medicine: M: 0.02%;F:0.04%);   (clothing:M:0.03%;   F:0.10%);(Itech:M:0.35%; F:0.30%) (Massmedia: M: 0.0.07%; F:0.07%) and household . E: M:0.05%; F:0.12% respectively.

Table.3.Frequency of usage of loanwords in terms of gender

Spheres of usage	Gender		Total loanwords
	Male	Female	
Education	14(0.08%)	28(0.16%)	42
Sport	13(0.07%)	6(0.03%)	19
Professions	15(0.08%)	11(0.06%)	26
Food	10(0.05%)	19(0.11%)	29
Medicine	5(0.02%)	8(0.04%)	13
i-tech	60(0.35%)	52(0.30%)	112
Mass media	12(0.07%)	13(0.07%)	25
Household. E	9(0.05%)	21(0.12%)	30
Clothing	6(0.03%)	18(0.10%)	24

Our first research question asked whether is there any relationship between the gender of the participants and the use of Anglicism in the Persian language.

The results indicated that there is relation between gender of participants and adoption of loanwords in that females showed a tendency to employ more loanwords than males in such fields as education, food, household. E, and clothing while males employed more loanwords in other domains including sport, profession and I-Tech.

To indicate the frequency of loanwords in terms of age of the participants, several types of existing files including posts and comments, videos and clips of the group members' have been examined. The following table shows the frequency of the various categories of loanwords in this regard. The reported frequency for youngsters within the group is:education:22;sport:9; professionals:18; food:9; Medicine:4; I-

tech:52; Mass media:15; household. E: 8,and clothing:6.Similarly the frequency of various loanwords employed by adults showed a much more different pattern of usage regarding two previous age categories as 3,3,5,13,7, and17 instances of loanwords were found in the fields of education, sport, professions, food, medicine and I-Tech respectively; moreover, the frequency of loanwords in other fields including, mass media household. E, and Clothing were 8, 17, and 4.

Accordingly, except for some spheres such as medicine, food, households. E, and clothing in which the number of loanwords employed by youngsters was less than other age groups, in the other domains including education, profession, I-Tech, and mass media the number of Anglicism was greater.

Table.4.Frequency of usage of loanwords in terms of age

Spheres of usage	Age			Total loanwords
	Teen	young	Adult	
Education	17(0.10%)	22(0.13%)	3(0.01%)	42
Sport	7(0.04%)	9(0.05%)	3(0.01%)	19
Professions	3(0.01%)	18(0.10%)	5(0.02%)	26
Food	7(0.04%)	9(0.05%)	13(0.07%)	29
Medicine	2(0.01%)	4(0.02%)	7(0.04%)	13
I-tech	43(0.26%)	52(0.30%)	17(0.10%)	112
Mass media	2(0.01%)	15(0.08%)	8(0.04%)	25
Household. E	5(0.02%)	8(0.04%)	17(0.10%)	30
Clothing	14(0.08%)	6(0.03%)	4(0.02%)	24

To address our third research question concerning the relationship between educational statuses of the participants and use of Anglicism the available corpus was analyzed in terms of three educational categories namely low, middle, and highly educated members. The results are presented in the Table.5

Table.5. Frequency of usage of loanwords in terms of educational level

Spheres of usage	Educational status			Total loanwords
	Low	Middle	High	
Education	5(0.02%)	15(0.08%)	22(0.13%)	42
Sport	7(0.04%)	7(0.04%)	5(0.02%)	19
Professions	6(0.03%)	9(0.05%)	10(0.05%)	26
Food	14(0.08%)	10(0.05%)	5(0.02%)	29
Medicine	2(0.01%)	5(0.02%)	6(0.03%)	13
i-tech	18(0.10%)	47(0.27%)	47(0.27%)	112
Mass media	3(0.01%)	10(0.05%)	12(0.07%)	25
Household. E	15(0.08%)	8(0.04%)	7(0.04%)	30
Clothing	7(0.04%)	9(0.05%)	8(0.04%)	24

Therefore, based on these results we can claim that the higher the educational status of participants the more loanwords will be employed by group members. And this is particularly true for some domains like education in which statistically speaking the percentage of loanwords for high level is 1.6 and6.5 times more frequent than those of low and middle levels or in I-Tech for which both middle and high levels are 2.7 times more frequent than that of low level.

9. Discussion

A total number of 320 Anglicism items categorized into nine separate functional domains was found from among 16910 words observed and analyzed in the corpus of the study. This amounts to 1.89% of the total corpus of words.

As already mentioned, the frequency of Anglicism in Persian was shown to be highly correlated with the variables of age, gender, and educational class. The findings revealed that Persian speakers' tendency to use Anglicism is drastically increased as the educational level of speaker increases. Moreover, the gender-based analysis of Anglicism frequency in Persian language highlighted that per gender has its own preference to employ Anglicism of particular domain is more than other gender. Finally, an age-based examination of available corpus revealed that almost all age ranges engaged in telegram social networking are somehow using Anglicism; however, we are encountered with an increasing intensity of usage on the part of Iranian youngster telegram users.

It was found that the Anglicism items entering into Persian via social networking of Telegram consist of both nouns and verbs. While an overwhelming majority of the borrowed items identified are nouns, there are also some verbs and even compound verbs with a particle originated from the recipient language. e.g.(*/Telegram + kardan/* or */telegram+ kon/.*

In addition to this, it was found that there were some compound blended loanwords for adaptation of which a consideration of monosyllabic, disyllabic and polysyllabic items needs to be taken into account. e.g. Internet instead of */Shabake Jahany/* or */Shabake Beinolmelaly/.*Therefore, the principle of economy may be the main criterion here in determining the type of features that will be borrowed.

The results observed in this study can be interpreted and justified in terms of the following explanations:

1. the most conspicuous reason for borrowing words is lack of some lexical items in recipient language. In other words, the factor of need plays an important role. Therefore, in general terms the findings of this study are consistent with those of

Winford (2003) who divides the motivation of lexical borrowing into two main categories, need and prestige and(Kenstowicz and Atiwong, 2004: 1) asserting that Language borrowing may occur as a result of social and cultural factors. The users of receiver language may fill the lexical gaps of the language through borrowing from other languages.

2. The majority of loanwords are much more easier to pronounce than their Persian equivalents which are usually two component words and difficult to pronounce. e.g voice for */faile souti/.*This is in line with the factor of convenience which is assumed to plays a significant role concerning integrating new vocabulary. In some cases, it may be much easier for speakers of a Persian, to borrow a foreign word than to create a new one in their target language (Field, 2002).

3. The reason for mispronunciation of some English loanwords particularly for low-educated people is due to phonography of English loanwords via Persian orthographic system. e.g voice is written as and it is sometimes mispronounced as /vis/.

4. It seems that some Persian speakers imagine if they use Anglicism in their everyday speech it makes them look more civilized, educated and prestigious than others. That is why they often would rather to use foreign words even in such a cases where the Persian equivalent of an intended word is available and even easier to pronounce. This finding is compatible with the results of other studies concerning another crucial factor in word borrowing that is Social prestige. This plays a significant role, as using English words can give persons a higher status in some social contexts (Field, 2002). Many young speakers prefer to use English loanwords in their daily speech as it can give them a higher status among their peers. This factor is also supported by Myers-Scotton, who illustrated how the French during the Norman Conquest had a significant impact on English, as French culture was in higher regard than English was at the time (Myers-Scotton, 2002).

5. Finally, it seems that using Anglicisms in Persian language cannot be totally destructive and with negative consequences but vice versa it can empower and enrich Persian language as the Persian equivalent of many Anglicisms in Persian are totally English by themselves. E.g e-mail for /poste elekteronik/.

10. Conclusion

When dealing with technology, English stands above all other languages. Firstly, due to its universal presence as a widespread means of knowledge and communication and, secondly, because of the technological dominance of some of the countries that

speak English. One dimension of such technological dominance is the increasing prevalence of social networking systems including telegram network which facilitates and expedites the process of language contacts and accordingly word borrowing. Whatever so far presented and discussed in the paper leads us to conclude that English is an enormous resource pool from which Persian takes a great number of lexical borrowings. From the English loanwords found in this study, we may conclude that most of them were highly frequent terms and, thus, widely known by regular Telegram users. This may be due to the fact that in majority of cases Persian language lacks a proper equivalent for such technical terms and this is due to knowledge and technological gap between donor and recipient language so that the receiver language is obliged to adopt and adapt new technical words associated with novel technologies.

One implication of this study might be that in borrowing words from English to Persian, attention and attempt have to focus on finding and using appropriate Persian equivalents as the first choice. Yet, in cases of necessity loanwords must only occur appropriately since undue overuses or misuses of foreign words will lead to deterioration of Persian language. Lastly, as typical people of developing countries we must be watchful about the disadvantages as well as advantages of any newly received technology to make the best possible use of it and lessen the possible negative associated effects.

References

1. Armstrong, N. (2005). *Translation, linguistics, culture: A French-English handbook* (Vol. 27). Multilingual matters.
2. Baatarjav, E. A., Phithakkitnukoon, S., & Dantu, R.(2008, November). Group recommendation system for facebook. In *OTM Confederated International Conferences" On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems"* (pp. 211-219). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
3. Field, F. W. (2002). *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts* (Vol. 62). John Benjamins Publishing.
4. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., Hymas, N. (2010). *An introduction to language*. The United States of America: Cengage Learning.
5. Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual*.Harvard: Harvard University Press.
6. Hall, T. A., & Hamann, S. (2003). Loanword nativization in German. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, *22*(1), 56-85.
7. Haunz, C. (2007). *Factors in on-line loanword adaptation* Edinburg: University of Edinburgh.
8. Hoffer, B. L. (2005). Language borrowing and the indices of adaptability and receptivity. *Intercultural communication studies*, *14*(2), 53.
9.Hojati, A. (2012). A study of the Iranian EFL students' errors in the pronunciation of ten high-frequency technology-related English loan words. Yazd University. *Sheikhbahaee EFL Journal*, *1*(2).

10. Hojati,A.,Mirzaee,A.,*Roustaei*,M.(2013). *A study of false friends in English and Farsi. European journal of Humanities and Social Science*s.Vol.19,No.1

11. Hudaybergenova, A. (2003). The principles of creation of the translated ideographic dictionary of the banking terminology (on the materials of Russian, English and Kazakh languages). *Almaty: Izdatelsky Dom KazGYU, 2003*.

12. Islam, R. A. (2012). *The morphology of loanwords in Urdu: the Persian, Arabic and English strands.*

13. Kenstowicz, M. & Atiwong.S. (2004). Issues in loanword adaptation: a Case study from Thai. *Phonology Conference :Manchester*

14. Kim, K., & Kochetov, A. (2011). Phonology and phonetics of epenthetic vowels in loanwords: Experimental evidence from Korean. *Lingua*, *121*(3), 511-532.

15. Kuswara, A., Cram, A., & Richards, D. (2008, December). Web 2.0 supported collaborative learning activities: Towards an affordance perspective. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International LAMS & Learning Design Conference* (pp. 70-80).

16. LaCharité, D., & Paradis, C. (2005). Category preservation and proximity versus phonetic approximation in loanword adaptation. *Linguistic inquiry*, *36*(2), 223-258.

17. Ljosland, R. (2011). English as an Academic Lingua Franca: Language policies andmultilingual practices in a Norwegian university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 991-1004.

18. Marszałek-Kowalewska, K. (2009). *English borrowings in Farsi: a lexicographic and corpus-driven study of technical vocabulary*.

19. Marszałek-Kowalewska, K. (2013). Iranian language policy: a case of linguistic purism. *Investigationes linguiticae Vol. XXII*.

20. Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press on Demand.

21. Peperkamp, S., & Dupoux, E. (2003, August). Reinterpreting loanword adaptations: the role of perception. In *Proceedings of the 15th international congress of phonetic sciences* (Vol. 367, p. 370).

22. Preston, D. R., & Yamagata, A. (2004). Katakana representation of English loanwords: Mora conservation and variable learner strategies. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *8*(3), 359-379.

23. Rambe, P. (2012). Critical discourse analysis of collaborative engagement in Facebook postings. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 28*(2), 295-314. Retrieved from www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet28/rambe.html.

24. Sebastian, M. (2009) *The history of Arabic loanwords in Turkish.* http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/Linguistics

25. Tsvetkov, Y., & Dyer, C. (2016). Cross-lingual bridges with models of lexical borrowing. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.(JAIR)*, *55*, 63-93.

26. West, M. L. (1997). *The east face of Helicon: West Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth: West Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth*. Clarendon Press.

27. Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

28. Winter-Froemel, E. (2008). Studying loanwords and loanword integration: Two criteria of conformity. *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics*, *14*, 156-176.

29. Xia, X., & Miller, E. R. (2013). Reconstructing gender ideologies of English loanwords in Chinese. *Language & Communication*, *33*(3), 214-220.